

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

AUTHENTICOM, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

CDK GLOBAL, LLC, and
THE REYNOLDS AND REYNOLDS COMPANY,

17-cv-318-jdp

Defendants.

Plaintiff has moved for a preliminary injunction, Dkt. 51, which it has amply supported with a brief, proposed findings, and numerous declarations and exhibits, Dkts. 52-72. Plaintiff also seeks expedited briefing and a prompt hearing, which defendants have, unsurprisingly, opposed. Dkt. 74 and Dkt. 77.

I have some sympathy for defendants because plaintiff's filing is huge, even though it complies with the court's rules. But defendants don't propose any alternative, other than to summarily dismiss the requested injunction or combine it with a trial on the merits. That of course would require me to just ignore the imminent harm that plaintiff alleges, so those options are out. Today plaintiff asks for a status conference to set a schedule. A conference is unnecessary; I have heard fully from the parties about the timing and the difficulties they face.

Here's your schedule:

Defendants' opposition is due June 16;

Plaintiff may file a reply by June 22;

Evidentiary hearing: June 26-27.

Entered May 22, 2017.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

JAMES D. PETERSON
District Judge